



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

It is in such ways that biology may be used in the service of religion, both in strengthening personal character and in establishing right social relations. It demonstrates that some of the most important precepts of religion are statements of biological truth, and that the strongest personal character and the most effective social order can be developed only by including obedience to biological laws as an important factor. All the illustrations that could be introduced emphasize these same truths in varying degree, and it is evident that biology, dealing as it does with human structure, and therefore with much of human nature, is capable of establishing

peculiarly close relations with religion and with character.

We have discovered in these latter days that the body and the spirit are not mutually destructive antagonists, pitted against each other in mortal combat. Once spiritual development was measured by physical repression; but we have learned of our essential unity; and that body and spirit are fitted to be mutually stimulating. This means that biology and religion may have a common mission in the regeneration of man and of society; that they may be mutually helpful; and that both are needed to achieve the highest possible expression of human power.

ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE BOOK OF GENESIS

PROFESSOR LEWIS BAYLES PATON, PH.D., D.D.
Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Connecticut

IX. The Historical Character of Abraham

In the previous article (*Biblical World*, May, 1915, p. 294) we considered the Babylonian sources for the Amorite period (2500-1580 B.C.) and also the Hebrew sources for the same period in the Book of Genesis. We are now ready to consider in this article the historical conception of Abraham that we derive from these sources.

A. The Double Tradition in Regard to Abraham

1. *His two names*.—The two names that are given to the patriarch are

evidence that the traditions concerning him have come from two sources. Abram bears also the name Abraham. The names sound similar, but they have no etymological connection. *Ram* in Ab-ram is derived from the verb "to be high," and this name means either "father is high," or "Ram is a father." *Raham* in Ab-raham is a root unknown to Hebrew (Canaanite). In Arabic, it means "to send rain." Ab-raham would then mean "father has sent rain." Halèvy suggests that we should read the name Abirham, "chief of a multi-

tude," which is the interpretation given in Gen. 17:5. The compilers of Genesis have explained the difference by the hypothesis that the name of the patriarch was changed from Abram to Abraham, but this is manifestly only a device to escape the difficulty. The only natural explanation is that the two names represent independent traditions.

2. *The individual and the collective character of Abram-Abraham.*—In many of the narratives of Genesis Abram bears a clearly individual character. Thus in Gen., chap. 14, he is a person just as truly as Chedorla'omer, king of Elam, and Hammurabi, king of Babylon, with whom he fights. On the other hand, in other stories Abraham seems to be a national name, as in Mic. 7:20, "Thou wilt perform the truth unto Jacob and the mercy to Abraham." In the tenth and eleventh chapters of Genesis the names in the genealogies are all racial. It may well be that Abram who stands at the end of this list (Gen. 11:26) is racial also. Abram's coming from the east is scarcely conceivable in a warlike age as the journey of an individual with his immediate family, but is natural as the migration of a race. Hagar, the concubine of Abraham, is certainly a personified group of tribes. Her name means "village" or "encampment." In 16:1 she is called Miḡrith, "an Egyptian," but here with Winckler we should doubtless read Muḡrith, "a North Arabian." In 21:14 we read that she "wandered in the desert of Beersheba," an unlikely occupation for a solitary woman, but natural for a group of Bedawin. Her "son"

Ishmael is a well-known group of nomads that dwelt to the south and southeast of Palestine.

Keturah, Abram's second wife, means "incense," and her children are the incense-producing tribes of Western and Southern Arabia (25:1-6). Of these Midian is the nation with which Israel had to fight in the days of Moses and of Gideon. Sheba (Sabaea) is the land whose queen came to visit Solomon. Dedan is a tribe whose caravans are often mentioned by the prophets. These two conceptions of Abraham as an individual and as a people point to two independent cycles of tradition which may have been connected originally with the two names Abram and Abraham.

3. *The two dates assigned to Abram-Abraham.*—In Gen., chap. 14, Abram is represented as a contemporary of Amraphel (Hammurabi), the sixth king of the First Dynasty of Babylon (2123-2081 B.C.). The same conception is found when we compute the date of the patriarchs from the figures that are given in the Old Testament. Adding to 586 B.C., the date of the Exile, 430 years for the recorded lengths of the reigns of the kings of Judah from the building of the Temple to the Exile, 480 years (I Kings 6:1) from the Exodus to the building of the Temple, 400 years (Gen. 15:13) for the sojourn in Egypt, 130 years (Gen. 47:9) to the birth of Jacob, 60 years (Gen. 25:26) to the birth of Isaac, 25 years (Gen. 21:5; 12:4) to Abraham's migration, we obtain 2111 B.C. as the date of Abraham's migration, which falls within the reign of Hammurabi (2123-2081 B.C.) as fixed by astronomical calculations.¹

¹ Kugler, *Sternkunde und Sterndienst in Babel*, II (1912), 255 ff.

With this date assigned to Abram agrees the form of his name. Abram is identical with Abi-ramu, an Amorite name which occurs in a tablet of Apil-Sin, the fourth king of the First Dynasty of Babylon.¹ This shows that Abram was a common Amorite name during the period of the First Dynasty of Babylon. Lot, the companion of Abram, is doubtless the same as Lotan, one of the "sons" of Seir the Horite, according to Gen. 36:20; but this is the same as Rutén or Luten, which occurs in Egyptian texts as early as the Twelfth Dynasty, which was contemporary with the First Dynasty of Babylon.

On the other hand, our documents agree that Abraham belonged to the Aramaean race. J (Gen. 11:28 f.), E (Jos. 24:2), and P (Gen. 11:26 f.) agree that the father of Abram was Terah, whose name appears both as a god and as a place in the neighborhood of the Mesopotamian city of Haran. J (Gen. 22:20), E (Jos. 24:2), and P (Gen. 11:26 f.) agree that the brother of Abram was Nahor, whose name also appears as a god and as a place in Mesopotamia. One of the sons of Nahor was Kemuel, "the father of Aram" (Gen. 22:24), and Bethuel, the father of Rebekah, who in 25:20 is called "Bethuel, the Aramaean of Paddan-aram." Through recent archaeological discoveries the date of the Aramaean migration out of Arabia may be determined with great exactness. In the Tell el-Amarna letters (1400 B.C.) the princes of Syria complain that they are menaced by three tribes of Bedawin, the Ahlamu, the Sutu, and

the Habiru. These are coupled in such ways as to show that they were kindred peoples. Tiglath-pileser I, king of Assyria (ca. 1100 B.C.) calls the Ahlamu Aramaeans.² Adad-nirari I, in an account of the exploits of his father Puduilu, (ca. 1350 B.C.) joins the Sutu with the Ahlamu in such a way as to suggest that they were a nomadic people of the same Aramaean race. The name Habiru is the etymological equivalent of 'Tbri, "Hebrew," since in the Amarna letters ' is constantly represented by the Babylonian *h*. The Habiru were Hebrews in the wider sense; that is, they belonged to the group of tribes which Israel regarded as related to itself through descent from a common ancestor, Eber.

In the attacks of the Ahlamu, Sutu, and Habiru upon Syria and Palestine, as they are recorded in the Amarna letters and in Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions of the same period, we see the beginning of the great Aramaean migration, which in the succeeding centuries overflowed Syria, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, and Assyria, and gave its language to these regions. Before 1400 B.C. we find no trace of Aramaeans in either the Babylonian, the Egyptian, or the Assyrian monuments. Israel is first named in the triumphal inscription of Merneptah (1225 B.C.) discovered by Petrie in 1896 at Thebes; and Edom is first named in a document of the same king.

It appears accordingly that we have two contradictory conceptions of the time in which Abram lived. According to one he lived in the twenty-second

¹ Meissner, *Beiträge zum altbabylonischen Privatrecht*, Nos. 42 and 43. The same name occurs in five letters from the reign of Amisaduqa (Ungnad, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, VI, 60 ff.).

² *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, I, 32 f.

century B.C., according to the other he lived in the fifteenth century B.C.

4. *There are two conceptions of the region from which Abram migrated.*—According to P, possibly following E, it was Ur of the Chaldees in Babylonia (11:31); according to J, it was Haran in Mesopotamia. These two conceptions correspond with the two that we have noted already of the age to which the patriarch is assigned. Ur of the Chaldees was connected with the Amorite migration (2500 B.C.), while Haran was a chief center of the Aramaeans (1400 B.C.).

5. *There are two conceptions of the place in which Abram lived.*—One strand of tradition locates him in Canaan. His headquarters are at Hebron, and here he is buried (25:9). Many of the traditions of Abram are designed to explain the origin of the springs, holy trees, altars, and sepulchers of the land of Canaan. Thus Abram is connected with the wells of Beer-lahai-roi, and Beer-sheba (Gen. 16:14; 21:15-19; 21:30, 31); the "terebinth of the oracle" at Sechem, which in Judg. 9:37 is called the "terebinth of the diviners," and in Deut. 11:30 is said to have stood beside a *gilgal* or sacred stone circle; the terebinth of Mamre, the tamarisk of Beer-sheba (Gen. 12:6; 35:4; 13:18; 14:13; 18:1; 21:33); the mountain-top of Moriah (Gen., chap. 22); the tomb of Machpelah (Gen. 23:19; 25:9); the altars of Shechem, Bethel, Hebron, and Beer-sheba (Gen. 12:7; 12:8; 13:4; 13:18).

On the other hand, another set of traditions places Abram in the desert, to the south of Canaan. In Gen. 20:1 Abram resides in Gerar between Kadesh and Shur, and here runs the risk of hav-

ing his wife taken from him. In Gen., chap. 12, where the same story is related, but the scene is laid in Miṣraim (Egypt), we are doubtless to regard Miṣraim as a corruption of Musrim (Northwest Arabia) and to identify it with Gerar of the other narrative.

The children of Abraham also dwell outside of Canaan. The sons of Hagar are the clans of the eastern and southern desert, and those of Keturah are the tribes of Southern Arabia. The difficulty in this conception was felt even by the compilers of Genesis, and they have devised a number of curious theories to remove it. The foreign residence of Abraham's children they explain by a sending away out of Canaan in order to make more room for Isaac. Thus in 21:10 Sarah says of Hagar and Ishmael: "Cast out this bondwoman and her son, for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac." Of Abraham's other children we read (25:6): "Unto the sons of the concubines, which Abraham had, Abraham gave gifts; and he sent them away from Isaac his son, while he yet lived, eastward, into the east country."

6. *There are two conceptions of Abram's manner of life.*—In general he is represented as a nomad wandering from place to place with his flocks and herds (e.g., Gen. 12:5, 16; 13:1-3, 5-7; 20:1). On the other hand, the passages which connect him with Hebron suggest that this was his permanent residence. In Gen. 13:9 Abram and Lot agree to separate. Lot chooses Sodom as his residence (13:12) and here we find him living in 14:12; 19:1 ff. Abram chooses Hebron (13:14), and here he lives through all the events recorded in chaps.

14-19. The account of Abram's expedition against the kings of the east in 14:12-24 implies the closest political relations with the people of Hebron, and in chap. 23 Abram's purchase of a tomb in Hebron indicates that he is a permanent resident of that region. The Bedawin who are always on the move do not establish family tombs.

7. *There are two conceptions of Abram's military character.*—In Gen. 14:12-24 he is a mighty warrior, the leader of over three hundred trained men, confederate with three Amorite chieftains, who is strong enough to defeat the four kings of the east in a night surprise. In striking contrast to this, in most of the stories Abram appears as a timid person, unable to defend his rights, who is eager to avoid disputes. Thus in 13:8 Abram says to Lot, "Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between me and thee." In 12:11-13 and 20:2, 11:13 he says that his wife is his sister for fear that he may be killed on her account. In 21:25 ff. he submits to the taking away from him of a well that he has dug, and makes a covenant with the aggressors.

This series of antitheses in the stories constitutes the chief problem in determining the historical character of Abraham. Any theory that we form must do justice to both sets of facts. It must explain why the patriarch bears the two names Abram and Abraham, why he is both individual and collective, why he is assigned to the twenty-second century B.C. and also to the fifteenth, why he is associated with the Amorites and also with the Aramaeans, why he comes both from Ur and from Haran, why he lives in Canaan and also outside of it,

why he is both settled and nomadic, both warlike and peaceful.

B. Theories in Regard to the Historical Character of Abraham

We proceed now to consider the various theories that are proposed to explain the variant traditions in regard to Abraham.

a) *The individual theory.*—The theory of the compilers of the documents in Genesis was that Abraham was the individual forefather of the Hebrews, and this has been the traditional theory among Jews and Christians ever since. This theory does justice to one set of statements about the patriarch, but it does not do justice to the other set. It does not explain his two names. The idea that in the middle of his life his name was changed by God from Abram to Abraham (Gen. 17:5) is no solution at all. This theory does not explain the use of Abraham as a tribal designation in many of the stories. It does not explain how the Aramaean forefather of Israel could have lived in the Amorite period, 700 years before the Aramaeans had migrated out of Arabia; nor how, if Abram had preceded the rest of the Aramaeans, he could have maintained himself among the warlike Amorites who were already settled in Canaan. The hypothesis of a single clan wandering safely through the land of a different race is inconsistent with all that we know of ancient Canaan. This theory also fails to explain the other double features in the tradition. If Abram was the individual forefather of Israel, there is no reason why he should have come from two places, lived in two regions, and led two kinds of lives. Moreover,

history shows that tribes and nations do not arise by natural descent from single ancestors, but that common ancestry is a legal fiction designed to bind heterogeneous races together. For these reasons we conclude that the traditional theory of Abraham does not give an adequate explanation of the phenomena of our documents.

b) The collective theory.—Many modern critics hold that, while there may have been an individual named Abraham, this name was also applied to the clan of which he was the leader. Ewald, Delitzsch, Dillman, Kittel, König, Klostermann, Cornill, Prásek, Proksch, Burney, Ottley, Wade, tell us about an Abraham people that united with a Sarah people, and entered Canaan as early as 2100 B.C. This theory fails to explain the two names of the patriarch. It also fails to explain how an Aramaean people could have entered Canaan as early as 2100 B.C., or how it could have maintained itself peacefully among the Amorites who then occupied the land. It also fails to explain the contradictory elements in the tradition of Abraham.

c) The mythical theory.—An influential school of modern critics, represented by Dupuis, Bernstein, Goldziher, Stucken, Winckler, Zimmermann, Jeremias, Jensen, regards the stories of Abraham as transformed nature-myths. The grounds for this opinion are as follows:

1. The supernatural elements in these traditions. God appears to Abraham in bodily form, and talks with him face to face. Angels are his constant visitors, who sit at the door of his tent and eat the repast that he has prepared.

2. There are evidences of worship paid to Abraham and Sarah by the later

Hebrews. The traditions in Genesis record their burial-places with the same interest that they show in the holy springs, holy stones, holy trees, and holy mountains. At Hebron, the burial place of Sarah and Abraham, the chiefs made a covenant (II Sam. 5:3), and Absalom paid his vows (II Sam. 15:7, 12). It was a city of refuge (Josh. 20:7), and a city of the priests (Josh. 21:11). According to Sozomen religious rites were kept up here as late as Christian times. These facts suggest that Abraham and Sarah were ancient deities, whose cult lingered among the common people after they had been degraded from their former rank by the religion of Yahweh.

According to Winckler, Abraham was originally the Babylonian moon-god. His name Ab-ram, "high father," shows that he is an astral deity. He comes from Ur, the chief center of moon-worship in Southern Babylonia, to Haran, the chief seat of this worship in Mesopotamia. His 318 servants (Gen. 14:14) are the days in the year during which the moon is visible. He lives at Kirjath-arba, "the city of four," an allusion to the four phases of the moon, and at Beersheba, "the well of seven," a reference to the seven days in each phase of the moon. His wife is Sarah, "princess," a title of the goddess Ishtar, the planet Venus; and she is his sister, a relation that Ishtar bears to the moon-god Sin. Sarah's sister is Milcah, "queen," also a title of a Babylonian goddess. Abraham says to Lot, "If thou wilt take the left hand I will take the right hand; if thou wilt take the right hand, I will take the left" (Gen. 13:9). This corresponds to the relation of the moon to

the sun: both cannot shine at the same time.

This theory has enjoyed great popularity in Germany during the last few years; nevertheless, it is open to a number of formidable objections.

1. It exaggerates the supernatural element in Genesis. The only extraordinary events recorded in this book are manifestations of God, or of angels. Genesis itself recognizes the subjective character of these appearances in 31:11. "The angel of God said unto me in a dream"; and in 24:7, 40, where the prosperous journey of Abraham's servant is described as Yahweh's sending his angel before him. Such manifestations of God are found in every age. The theophanies to Abraham do not differ from those to Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. Visions of angels are recorded also in the cases of Mary, the mother of Jesus, and of Peter. Apart from these visionary experiences, there are no supernatural elements in Genesis. Miracles are never narrated. The lives of the patriarchs are a series of the simplest and most commonplace incidents. They wander from place to place with their flocks, they build altars, they dig wells and dispute with their neighbors for their possession, they go down to Egypt for food. All these are natural incidents in the life of a Bedawy folk.

2. The worship paid to the patriarchs does not prove that they were originally astral deities. Ancestors were worshiped by the Hebrews, as by the other Semites; for instance, the kings of Judah (Ezek. 43:7-9; II Chron. 16:14; 21:19; Jer. 34:5). A general worship of ancestors is referred to in Deut. 26:14;

Ps. 106:28. The patriarchs, accordingly, may have been historic ancestors quite as well as lunar deities.

3. The Babylonian astral religion with which the stories of the patriarchs are compared is known to us only from documents of the eighth century B.C. The mythologists assume that it was in existence in remote antiquity, but this has not been proved, and there are many reasons to believe the contrary. Accordingly, it is doubtful whether the Babylonian astral mythology is old enough to have furnished a basis for the Hebrew traditions in Genesis.¹

4. Superficial resemblance may be accidental, and does not prove that the Hebrew traditions are derived from Babylonian sources. Abram may mean "high father," but it may also mean "the father is high," or "the high one is father." In any case it does not need to be a divine title, for it occurs as the name of a Babylonian farmer in the reign of Ammišaduqa (1977 B.C.) in certain contract-tablets published by Ungnad.² Sarah may be the title of a goddess, but it may also be the name of a historic person. Winckler's method of finding Babylonian myths in the numbers of Genesis Jeremias cleverly satirizes by saying that the German emperor has seven children, six sons and one daughter. Here we have clearly a Babylonian myth. These seven children are the seven planets, one of which is feminine, the planet Venus.

5. Adherents of the mythological school do not agree among themselves in regard to the interpretation of Genesis. According to Winckler and his school, the patriarchs are moon-gods; but

¹ See Cumont, *Astrology*.

² *BA*, VI, 5, pp. 60 ff.

according to Jensen, they are sun-gods, and are variants of the Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic.

6. By the same methods of comparison Winckler shows that the Judges, and even David, are astral divinities. Jensen caps the climax by applying the same process to the Old Testament prophets and kings, and even to Jesus. The gospel history he reduces to a modified form of the Gilgamesh Epic. This is a *reductio ad absurdum* of the mythical theory. If even persons who stand in the full light of history can be explained as astral deities, we may well question whether the patriarchs are not historical after all.

7. The mythical theory does not explain the conflicting features in the tradition of Abraham any better than the individual theory or the collective theory. If Abram is a moon-god, why does he also bear the name Abraham? Why is he assigned to the Amorite period and also to the Aramaean period? Why does he come both from Ur and from Haran? Why does he live in Canaan and out of it? Why is he both settled and nomadic, both warlike and peaceful?

In view of these facts the Babylonian mythical theory must be pronounced unsatisfactory.

d) *The composite theory.*—In view of the contrary conceptions of Abram that are given by tradition in almost every particular, the only possible theory is that we have here the fusing of two originally distinct traditions, one of Amorite origin, the other of Hebrew origin. The tradition that spoke of Abram, the individual patriarch, the contemporary of Hammurabi (2100 B.C.) who came from Ur of the Chaldees, who

lived at Hebron and was confederate with the Amorites of that region, who led a settled life and bought a tomb for his family, who was a mighty warrior and defeated the kings of the east, is of Amorite origin, and was learned by the Israelites from the Amorites after the conquest of Canaan. It is highly probable that the Hebrews learned some of their traditions from the Amorites who occupied the land before them. Israel of the days of David and Solomon was not a lineal descendant of Israel of the days of Moses, but was the product of a mingling of Hebrew clans with the aboriginal inhabitants of the land. The Amorites were not exterminated, but they dwelt in the midst of Israel and eventually mingled with the Israelites. In this process Amorite traditions must have been learned by the Hebrews and blended with their own traditions. This has actually happened in the case of the Babylonian traditions of Gen., chaps. 1-11, which must have come to Israel by way of the Amorites. It would be surprising if some of the patriarchal traditions did not come from the same source.

On the other hand, the tradition of Abraham, a collective name for a group of Aramaean peoples, who invaded Palestine about 1400 B.C., who came from Haran in Mesopotamia, who did not enter Canaan proper but lived in the desert to the south and east of that land, who did not yet take up settled agricultural life but remained nomads, and who were not strong enough to attempt any warlike enterprises, is of genuine Hebrew origin, and was brought into Canaan by Israel at the time of the conquest. The combination of the traditions of Abram with those of Abra-

ham was the result of the fusing of Amorites and Hebrews into one people. When this union was effected it was only natural that the effort should be made to identify ancestors. The Amorites claimed descent from Abram, and the Hebrew immigrants from Abraham. The two names sounded alike, and there-

fore they were identified by means of the theory that Abram's name was changed to Abraham, which corresponded to the fact that the Amorites had been superseded by the Israelites. Thus the united traditions of the forefathers expressed the union of Amorites and Hebrews into one people, Israel.

VISCOUNT KANEKO ON CHRISTIANITY AND INTERNATIONALISM

EDITORIAL NOTE.—*During the recent visit of Dr. Gulick and myself to Japan as representatives of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America we had conferences with a number of the most distinguished Japanese statesmen concerning the relations of America and Japan. The particular interest at that time centered around the anti-Japanese legislation in the United States. In the course of one of these conferences Viscount Kaneko expressed himself so fully and effectively that I asked him to write the matter out for me, and the following letter recently received is in accordance with this request.*

The position of Viscount Kaneko among the statesmen of Japan is so pre-eminent and influential that his statements relative to the relations of Christianity and international affairs are entitled to great weight. Particular attention should be called to his last paragraph.

The list of Viscount Kaneko's official honors and positions may prove of interest: First class Rising Sun; Privy Councillor; hon. LLD. (Harvard); President of America's Friends Society; born at Fukuoka 1853; graduated Harvard University, U.S.A., class 1878; Private Secretary to Count Ito when he was Premier, 1885-86, and when he was President of the Privy Council 1888-90; Chief Secretary of the House of Peers 1890; Vice-Minister of Agriculture and Commerce 1894-96; and finally Minister of Agriculture and Commerce April to June, 1898, and Minister of Justice October, 1900, to May, 1901. On the outbreak of the late Russo-Japanese war he was sent to the United States to represent Japan unofficially, and returned home soon after the conclusion of peace. He was chairman of the Japan Grand Exhibition to be held in 1912, but with its postponement to 1917 by the Katsura Cabinet, he resigned the post.—SHAILER MATHEWS.

"It gives me much pleasure to comply with your request to state what I think about the so-called 'Japanese question in America,' and in so doing I must confess

at once that after carefully considering the matter, the point in question seems to be, at heart, a moral issue rather than an economic problem. In order to treat the